



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

B

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,630	06/29/2005	Bernd Bufo	BB-138	7026
23557	7590	01/19/2007	EXAMINER	
SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION PO BOX 142950 GAINESVILLE, FL 32614-2950			ULM, JOHN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1649	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/19/2007	PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/528,630	BUFE ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	John D. Ulm	1649

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7,9-19,21 and 24 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6,10-12 and 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7,9,12,14-19 and 24 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                                |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                           | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/7/05</u> | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|                                                                                                                                | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 1649

1) Claims 1 to 7, 9 to 19, 21 and 24 are pending in the instant application.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19 and 24 have been amended as requested by Applicant in the correspondence filed 03 November of 2006.

2) Claims 6, 10, 11, 13 and 21, and claims 12 and 24 in so far as they do not relate to an isolated polypeptide, an isolated nucleic acid encoding that polypeptide, or methods of use, are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 03 November of 2006. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

3) Claims 12 and 24 are objected to as reciting an improper Markush Group. M.P.E.P. 803.02 states that:

“Since the decisions in *In re Weber* \*\*, 198 USPQ 328 (CCPA 1978); and *In re Haas*, 198 USPQ 334 (CCPA 1978), it is improper for the Office to refuse to examine that which applicants regard as their invention, unless the subject matter in a claim lacks unity of invention, *In re Harnish*, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980); *Ex Parte Hozumi*, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984). Broadly, unity of invention exists where compounds included within a Markush group (1) share a common utility and (2) share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility.”

Claim 12 is improper because an antibody, the extracellular domain of a receptor protein, and an inhibiting RNA do not share a common utility that is based upon shared substantial structural feature. Claim 24 is improper because a polynucleotide encoding

a protein and a polynucleotide complementary thereto do not share a common utility that is based upon shared substantial structural feature. Correction is required.

4) The table presented on pages 17 to 19 of the instant specification does not comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.52 (b) with respect to both spacing and font size. 37 C.F.R. 1.52 (b) states that:

" Except for drawings, the application papers (specification, including claims, abstract, oath or declaration, and papers as provided for in this part) and also papers subsequently filed, must have each page plainly written on only one side of a sheet of paper, with the claim or claims commencing on a separate sheet and the abstract commencing on a separate sheet. See §§ 1.72(b) and 1.75(h). The sheets of paper must be the same size and either 21.0 cm. by 29.7 cm. (DIN size A4) or 21.6 cm. by 27.9 cm. (8 ½ by 11 inches). Each sheet must include a top margin of at least 2.0 cm. (3/4 inch), a left side margin of at least 2.5 cm. (1 inch), a right side margin of at least 2.0 cm. (3/4 inch), and a bottom margin of at least 2.0 cm. (3/4 inch), and no holes should be made in the sheets as submitted. The lines of the specification, and any amendments to the specification, must be 1 ½ or double spaced. The pages of the specification including claims and abstract must be numbered consecutively, starting with 1, the numbers being centrally located above or preferably, below, the text. See § 1.84 for drawings.

37 C.F.R. 1.58 (c) states that:

Chemical and mathematical formulae and tables must be presented in compliance with § 1.52(a) and (b), except that chemical and mathematical formulae or tables may be placed in a landscape orientation if they cannot be presented satisfactorily in a portrait orientation. Typewritten characters used in such formulae and tables must be chosen from a block (nonscript) type font or lettering style having capital letters which are at least 0.21 cm. (0.08 inch) high (e.g., elite type). A space at least 0.64 cm. (1/4 inch) high should be provided between complex formulae and tables and the text. Tables should have the lines and columns of data closely spaced to conserve space, consistent with a high degree of legibility.

Correction is required.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5) Claims 1 to 5, 7, 9, 12, 14 to 19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description and enablement requirements. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention and in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The instant claims expressly require "the polypeptide having the deduced amino acid sequence as shown in SEQ ID NO:2" and/or a polynucleotide "having the coding sequence, as shown in SEQ ID NO:1". The claimed subject matter is neither enabled nor adequately described because the sequence presented in SEQ ID NO:1 of the instant application is an amino acid sequence and the sequence presented in SEQ ID NO:2 is a nucleotide sequence. In the decision of *The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company*, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (CAFC 1997), the court held that:

"To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.* , 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); *In re Gosteli*, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("[T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." *Lockwood* , 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

An adequate written description of a DNA, such as the cDNA of the recombinant plasmids and microorganisms of the '525 patent, "requires a precise definition, such as

Art Unit: 1649

by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties," not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention. *Fiers v. Revel*, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, "an adequate written description of a DNA requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it; what is required is a description of the DNA itself." *Id.* at 1170, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

Because the instant application does not currently disclose a nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO:1 or an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:2, it does not describe the claimed invention by providing a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties of the claimed invention.

Further, in so far as claim 24 encompasses a method of treatment by the administration of a polynucleotide, there is not a single example described in either the instant specification or the art of record of the successful treatment of an animal by the administration of a polynucleotide encoding a member of the G protein-coupled receptor family. One of ordinary skill would not reasonably expect the exogenous administration of a nucleic acid encoding all or part of a protein of the instant invention to a mammal to have a clinical effect because the art of gene therapy has not developed to the level of a routine practice in the clinical arts. It is noted that several genetic defects associated with diseases such as sickle cell anemia and cystic fibrosis are well known in the art, as are the genetic corrections needed to cure these diseases, and yet these diseases have not been successfully treated by gene therapy. A patent is granted for a completed invention, not the general suggestion of an idea and how that idea might be developed into the claimed invention. In the decision of *Genentec, Inc, v. Novo Nordisk*, 42 USPQ2d 100,(CAFC 1997), the court held that:

"[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable" and that "[t]ossing out the mere germ of an idea does not constitute enabling disclosure". The court further stated that "when there is no disclosure of any specific starting material or of any of the conditions under which a process is to be carried out, undue experimentation is required; there is a failure to meet the enablement requirements that cannot be rectified by asserting that all the disclosure related to the process is within the skill of the art", "[i]t is the specification, not the knowledge of one skilled in the art, that must supply the novel aspects of an invention in order to constitute adequate enablement".

The instant specification is not enabling because one can not follow the guidance presented therein and practice the claimed method without first making a substantial inventive contribution.

Claim 7 is not enabled in so far as it encompasses a process of producing a polypeptide by culturing a host cell comprising the complementary strand of a polynucleotide encoding that polypeptide.

Claims 9 and 12 are not enabled in so far as they require a polypeptide that is encoded by the complementary strand of a polynucleotide encoding that polypeptide.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7) Claims 1 to 5, 7, 9, 12, 14 to 19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7.1) Claims 1 to 5, 7, 9, 12, 14 to 19 and 24 are vague and indefinite because there is no antecedent basis for "the deduced amino acid sequence as shown in SEQ

ID NO:2", "the coding sequence, as shown in SEQ ID NO:1", "the mature form of the polypeptide", and the plural form of "polynucleotides".

7.2) Claims 1 to 5, 7, 9, 12, 14 to 19 and 24 are vague and indefinite because the metes and bounds of the term "stringent conditions" is conditional and no defining set of conditions is recited in the claims or described in the specification. At best, the text in lines 22 to 26 on page 7 of the specification defines the terms "moderate hybridization conditions" and "highly stringent conditions". In addition, the term "preferable" renders these claims indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8) Applicant is advised that, had claims 1, 2, 7, 9 and 19 referred to the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1 and/or the nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO:2 they would encompass naturally occurring products and/or processes, which would be nonstatutory subject matter. As such, they would have been subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9) Applicant is advised that the nucleotide sequence presented in SEQ ID NO:2 of the instant application is 99.8% identical to the sequence presented in SEQ ID NO:1 of each of the Adler patent documents (WO 01/77676 A1, US 20020094551 A1), which are available against the instant application under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and 102(e), respectively.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John D. Ulm whose telephone number is (571) 272-0880. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1649

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



JOHN ULM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1600